

REMARKS

The office action stated that claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-13, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leyden '258. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons. Applicant's claim 1 and 11 each require a locking part rotationally coupled with said locking mechanism and having an axis of rotation eccentrically disposed with respect to the longitudinal axis of said first aperture, said locking part dimensioned to interact with at least a portion of a locking section of a shaft. It is unclear from the office action which component of Leyden addresses these particular claim limitations. The component in Leyden which interacts with the locking end of the first locking member does not rotate (catch 96). Leyden's specification states that the catch 96 moves vertically in the direction of the arrow 98. Thus as Leyden's catch moves vertically and does not rotate, it cannot be rotationally coupled. With respect to claim 19, Leyden does not teach providing a locking mechanism with a first and second aperture, and rotating said second aperture out of alignment with the first aperture. Applicant respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specify which particular components of Leyden read on Applicant's claim.

The office action further stated that claims 1,2,4,5,8,9,11,12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Germany 2425386. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons. Applicant's claim 1 and 11 each require a locking mechanism, at least a portion of which is rotatable between a locked and unlocked position, and a locking part rotationally coupled with a locking mechanism and having an axis of rotation eccentrically disposed with respect to the longitudinal axis of said first aperture, said locking part dimensioned to interact with at least a portion of a locking section of a shaft. It is unclear from the office action which component of the German reference addresses Applicant's locking mechanism and locking part. If part 18 of the German reference is the claimed locking mechanism, then only the spring 29 could be the locking part. (If part 18 is the locking part, then what part is the claimed locking mechanism?) *key 23*
The spring 29 does not interact with a portion of the locking end of the first locking member. Claim 2 further requires that the locking part have a second aperture to allow passage of the locking end

therethrough, and to further engage the locking end. No part of the German lock appears to satisfy this limitation. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections to claims 1, 11 and the dependent claims be withdrawn. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specify which particular components of the German reference read on Applicant's claim.

The office action further stated that claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 102(B) as being clearly anticipated by Avauisini '395. Amended claim 18 was amended to clarify that a sleeve of the pin lock is mountable over at least a portion of said shaft. The liners 22 of Avauisini '395 are not part of the lock, but function to line the holes of the skis. See Col. 2, lines 8-10. For the foregoing reason, Applicant respectfully request this rejection to be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3-24-2003

By: June Rickey
June E. Rickey, Reg. No. 40,144
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
Customer No. 24024
(216) 622-8543

*12/23/03 no longer
with the firm*



MARKED UP VERSION OF CLAIMS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

18. A pin lock comprising:

a first locking member including a shaft with a locking end and a retaining end;
a second locking member dimensioned to receive at least a portion of said locking end of said shaft and lockable into said locking end of said shaft; and
a sleeve [dimensioned to fit] mountable over at least a portion of said shaft.